



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Developing Social Cohesion through Schools in Northern Ireland and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: A Study of Policy Transfer

Loader, R., Hughes, J., Petroska-Beshka, V., & Tomovska Misoska, A. (2018). Developing Social Cohesion through Schools in Northern Ireland and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: A Study of Policy Transfer. *Journal on Education in Emergencies*, 4(1), 114-140. <https://doi.org/10.17609/hkpx-p638>

Published in:
Journal on Education in Emergencies

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

Copyright 2018 Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies
This is an open access Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits use, distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.



JOURNAL ON EDUCATION IN EMERGENCIES

Developing Social Cohesion through Schools in Northern Ireland and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: A Study of Policy Transfer

Author(s): Rebecca Loader, Joanne Hughes, Violeta Petroska-Beshka, and Ana Tomovska Misoska

Source: *Journal on Education in Emergencies*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (August 2018), pp. 114 - 140

Published by: Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies

Stable URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/2451/42482>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17609/hkpx-p638>

REFERENCES:

This is an open-source publication. Distribution is free of charge. All credit must be given to authors as follows:

Loader, Rebecca, Joanne Hughes, Violeta Petroska-Beshka, and Ana Tomovska Misoska. 2018. "Developing Social Cohesion through Schools in Northern Ireland and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: A Study of Policy Transfer." *Journal on Education in Emergencies* 4 (1): 114-40.

The ***Journal on Education in Emergencies (JEiE)*** publishes groundbreaking and outstanding scholarly and practitioner work on education in emergencies (EiE), defined broadly as quality learning opportunities for all ages in situations of crisis, including early childhood development, primary, secondary, non-formal, technical, vocation, higher and adult education.

Copyright © 2018, Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies. All rights reserved.



The *Journal on Education in Emergencies*, published by the [Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies \(INEE\)](#), is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](#).

DEVELOPING SOCIAL COHESION THROUGH SCHOOLS IN NORTHERN IRELAND AND THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA: A STUDY OF POLICY TRANSFER

REBECCA LOADER, JOANNE HUGHES, VIOLETA PETROSKA-BESHKA,
AND ANA TOMOVSKA MISOSKA

ABSTRACT

Transferring education policy from one country to another, or between supranational bodies and national administrations, is common practice, and the potential benefits for educational quality and standards are evident. Despite these advantages, the dominant approaches to policy transfer have been criticized for, among other things, neglecting contextual influences on policy and prioritizing the economic function of education over others. In this article, we consider an example of policy transfer for another purpose: to promote social cohesion through schools, specifically in societies that have experienced ethnic division and conflict. Focusing on the model of shared education, which promotes school collaboration and contact between pupils across ethnic or religious boundaries, we explore a process of policy transfer between Northern Ireland and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Drawing from documentary analysis, interviews with practitioners in both countries, and direct observational experience, we examine the purpose, nature, and impact of this case of policy transfer and identify what lessons can be shared with future education initiatives.

Received March 1, 2018; revised June 5, 2018, accepted June 17, 2018; electronically published August 2018.

Journal on Education in Emergencies, Vol. 4, No. 1

Copyright © 2018 by the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). All rights reserved.
ISSN 2518-6833

INTRODUCTION

This article explores the process of transferring an intercultural education program—that is, shared education—between its country of origin, Northern Ireland, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (hereafter Macedonia). In the field of comparative education, the practice of studying international educational systems to draw lessons to apply in other contexts is well established. Having emerged as an imperative in the 1960s, as policy-makers and researchers sought to improve national education systems within a climate of international political competition (Cowen 2014), the field has expanded over the past three decades (Auld and Morris 2014; Steiner-Khamsi 2010). This growth, Auld and Morris argue, has accompanied the transition to a new paradigm of applied comparative education that is promoted by international consultants, policy entrepreneurs, and think tanks. The new paradigm views education as “an economic investment designed to cultivate human capital so as to maximize a nation’s competitiveness in the global economy” (Auld and Morris 2014, 149). Within this framework, international comparison is endorsed as a means of identifying best practice in existing high-performing education systems, which then can be shared and implemented in other countries to enhance their educational—and thus economic—success. Consistent with the emphasis in this approach on measurement and targets (Cowen 2014), exemplar countries are frequently identified by their leading position in global rankings, such as OECD’s Programme for International Student Assessment and the World Bank’s World Development Indicators.

The benefits of this normative approach to identifying and sharing lessons—what we refer to in this article as policy transfer—are evident.¹ Policy-makers who have access to information about other countries’ experiences can gain valuable insights that will inform improvements they make in their own contexts and, as importantly, enable them to avoid reforms that have been unsuccessful elsewhere (Burdett and O’Donnell 2016; Johansson 2016). Increased examination of education systems across different countries can also increase transparency, reduce parochialism, and encourage cross-national collaboration (Dimmock and Tan 2016). However, current approaches to policy transfer in education have drawn criticism, chiefly from academic comparativists. One strand of this criticism has

1 The most appropriate term for this process has been the subject of some debate, with terms such as “policy borrowing,” “policy learning,” “lesson-drawing” also in use. In this article, we prefer the term “policy transfer” as the most suitable for the case we discuss. In this, we are influenced by Divala’s argument that “‘borrowing’ assumes an agential relationship that ultimately ends up in the lender owing back what is due to the self. On the other hand, ‘policy transfer’ simply recognises the origin of policy and the end user of policy” (2014, 99).

challenged what is perceived as a narrow focus on the economic function of education and the relatively limited interest in other aims, such as the development of social cohesion and citizenship (Auld and Morris 2014, 136). Another strand of criticism has argued for greater attention to the cultural, political, and historical contexts of the relevant countries when proposing the transfer of policies and processes (Andrews et al. 2014; Dimmock and Tan 2016; Morris 2012).

These criticisms of normative approaches to transfer have emerged from the analytical tradition (Steiner-Khamsi 2012, 2014) in comparative education, which seeks to theorize the policy transfer process. While normative studies promote transfer as a means of improving educational quality and outcomes, the analytical literature prioritizes the explication of the transfer process, its antecedents, and its outcomes. Among the longstanding concerns of this literature are the motives for policy transfer, the level at which transfer occurs (international, domestic, or interorganizational), what is transferred (policy aims, ideologies, programs, or institutions), and the effect on the recipient context (Burdett and O'Donnell 2016; Dolowitz and Marsh 2000; Hulme 2005; Phillips and Ochs 2003; Steiner-Khamsi 2006, 2014). Researchers examining the first of these concerns have identified several motives for transferring policy, including the failure of existing policy, economic and political change (including change of government), and a desire to quell domestic political conflict or to legitimize a preferred policy approach (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000; Halpin and Troyna 1995; Phillips and Ochs 2003; Steiner-Khamsi 2006). Such findings reveal that policy transfer is not merely a matter of importing best practice. Consistent with criticism of normative studies for their neglect of contextual influences, scholars in the analytical tradition also emphasize the importance of context to any understanding of the transfer process. In this regard, they argue that researchers should consider “inherited ideas and values, habits and customs, institutions and world views” (Alexander 2001, 5) within the settings of interest.

While normative and analytical approaches represent separate strands within policy transfer, they are not mutually exclusive, and comparative scholars are often engaged in research in both traditions (Steiner-Khamsi 2014; for examples see Harris, Jones, and Adams 2016; Ochs 2006; Phillips and Ochs 2004). Like these researchers, we aim to bring normative and analytical perspectives together in our work to develop and research a model of shared education that promotes interschool collaboration across ethnic and religious boundaries as a way to enhance social cohesion. As critical advocates of shared education, we aim to identify lessons learned from its implementation “that, under certain circumstances and in specific contexts, could be transferred to other educational

systems” (Steiner-Khamsi 2014, 154). We reflect simultaneously on the process of policy transfer and explore how shared education is interpreted and implemented in different settings. These aims are reflected in the present study, which is the first to explore the transfer of shared education from its original context in Northern Ireland to a new setting in Macedonia.

THE CURRENT STUDY

To explore in depth the experience of transferring the shared education model, we undertake a two-stage analysis. In the first part of the paper, we examine the development of shared education in both Northern Ireland and Macedonia. We draw from the policy and research literature and from the observational experience of Hughes and Petroska-Beshka, both of whom have been involved in this process of transferring and implementing shared education. The second part of the paper complements this policy-level discussion with an exploration of shared education in practice. In it we draw from qualitative data collected through interviews with principals, teachers, and program coordinators in both jurisdictions. We aim to draw our own lessons from this analysis in two ways. First, we identify lessons learned that will help the shared education initiatives under study to meet their aim of improving relations between previously opposing groups. We anticipate that these lessons might inform the future development of shared education in other contexts, given the interest national governments and international bodies such as the UN have expressed in the program (see UNESCO 2017). Second, we analyze the policy transfer process, exploring its purpose, nature, and impact. As this paper focuses on a case of interorganizational transfer that involved academic and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), it provides a valuable opportunity to explore issues at this level (Hulme 2005).

A note on terminology: while “shared education” is the term applied to the general model of collaborative education that we discuss in this article, it is also commonly used for the specific program operating in Northern Ireland. We use it in both senses in this article and aim to make the meaning clear from the context. In Macedonia, the equivalent initiative is known as the Interethnic Integration in Education Program, or IIEP. We shall use this term, or simply “interethnic education,” when referring specifically to the Macedonian program.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFER OF SHARED EDUCATION

SHARED EDUCATION IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Shared education was introduced in Northern Ireland in 2007 with the aim of promoting collaboration and intergroup contact across separate denominational schools. These schools, which mirror the cleavage between the Catholic-Irish-nationalist and the Protestant-British-unionist communities, educate more than 90 percent of the region's pupils (Department of Education [NI] 2017). Separate education has long been a source of contention in the region, with commentators suggesting that the physical and cultural isolation of pupils may perpetuate prejudice and division (Murray 1985; Grayling 2005). While supporters of separate schools have repudiated this claim, initiatives to promote intercommunity contact and mutual understanding through education were nevertheless introduced from the 1970s onwards (Gallagher 2004).

Among the programs emerging during this period were those promoting cross-group contact as a means of improving attitudes and fostering positive relationships between the two groups. Informed by the contact hypothesis (Allport 1954; Hewstone and Swart 2011), these initiatives included integrated schools that educated pupils from all denominational backgrounds in the same institutions and so-called contact programs that provided activities and excursions for pupils attending separate schools. While important, these initiatives had mixed success. Despite research indicating that school-based contact has a positive impact on students' attitudes (Hayes, McAllister, and Dowds 2007, 2013; Hughes et al. 2013; Stringer et al. 2009), integrated education today remains a niche sector, accounting for only 7 percent of pupils in Northern Ireland (Department of Education [NI] 2017). Meanwhile, contact programs in schools have been limited by their short-term nature and low priority, and by teachers' lack of confidence in facilitating such interaction (O'Connor, Hartop, and McCully 2002; Richardson 2011).

Recognizing the need for a new approach to promoting integration through the education system, educationalists led by Professor Tony Gallagher of Queen's University Belfast (QUB) developed proposals for shared education in 2005. These proposals aimed to address the limitations of existing initiatives by (1) providing pupils from all schools, not only those in the integrated sector, with opportunities for sustained cross-group contact; and (2) appealing to schools' core priority—enhancing the provision of education. The proposals recommended creating collaborative school partnerships across denominational lines as a mechanism for enhancing social relations. The partnerships would provide joint classes and

activities on a regular basis, and pupils would travel between the participating schools to learn in mixed groups. This would enable young people to interact and build relationships while also helping schools extend their curriculum and share expertise and resources. In developing this model, the architects of shared education were able to capitalize on the increasing prominence of collaboration in education policy (see Independent Strategic Review of Education 2006; Post-Primary Review Body 2001), as well as a new legal requirement (the Entitlement Framework) for schools in Northern Ireland to offer a minimum number of subjects to students ages 14 to 18. The emphasis on the curriculum helped secure the participation of schools that may have been reluctant to engage in a program focused primarily on reconciliation.

Shared education was introduced in 2007 via three pilot initiatives that involved both primary and postprimary schools and were supported by two philanthropic organizations, the Atlantic Philanthropies and the International Fund for Ireland. Prospective school partners were invited to submit a joint application and, if successful, were assigned funding for equipment, staff, and other costs of participation. From the outset, each partnership was encouraged to develop an activity program that addressed the educational priorities of the participating schools. The only stipulation was that “the partnerships had to contain sustainable, high quality engagement by young people from different cultural traditions and backgrounds” (SEP 2008, 2). These pilot initiatives continued until 2013; one of the three—a postprimary program managed by QUB—involved 150 schools across two cohorts (Knox 2013). Early evaluations of these shared education programs were favorable. Pupils at the participating schools reported having new friends from the other religious group and were found to have more positive intergroup attitudes than those at non-participating institutions (Hughes et al. 2010).

Recognizing the importance of communicating these and other benefits of shared education to policy-makers and politicians, the initiatives’ leaders invested significant time and resources in a regional advocacy strategy. This proved effective, as Northern Ireland’s four main political parties included references to educational sharing and collaboration in their manifestos for the 2011 Northern Ireland Assembly election (Hansson, O’Connor-Bones, and McCord 2013), and the Northern Ireland Executive (2011) subsequently agreed to incorporate shared education into their Program for Government. This led to the appointment of the Ministerial Advisory Group on Shared Education in 2012, the introduction of the Shared Education Signature Project across Northern Ireland in 2015, and the passing of the Shared Education Act in May 2016. The act made it a statutory duty of the Northern Ireland Department of Education to encourage, facilitate,

and promote shared education and established it as a core element of education policy in the region.

SHARED EDUCATION IN MACEDONIA

In 2009, researchers from the Centre for Shared Education at QUB were appointed to a UNICEF-sponsored project to work with local authorities in Macedonia to develop mechanisms for enhancing interethnic relations through schools. Due to the constitutional provision for mother-tongue instruction, virtually all ethnic Macedonian pupils and more than 95 percent of Albanian pupils are educated in their first language, either in separate schools or in separate shifts or buildings within multilanguage schools (Lyon 2013). There is also a provision, albeit less common, for instruction in the Turkish and Serbian languages. While this is considered good practice from a minority rights perspective, there has been concern about the resulting segregation of pupils from different ethnic groups, particularly against a background of interethnic conflict and violence (Reka 2008; Lyon 2013). Efforts to address educational separation, notably via a ministerial Strategy for Integrated Education (Ministry of Education and Science 2010), have been stymied by politicians concerned about the reaction within their ethnic constituencies (Koneska 2012). In the absence of political action, NGOs have assumed responsibility for advancing integration.

Through the UNICEF project, members of the Centre for Shared Education, led by Hughes worked with officials and educationalists in Macedonia to develop a systematic approach for intercultural education. The intention was to draw from Northern Ireland's experience of shared education and to complement existing intercultural education initiatives in Macedonia. The latter included extracurricular multicultural workshops, which promoted interaction between mixed groups of pupils who learned about diversity through a series of hour-long meetings (see Dedova et al. 2010 for more details on the content of these workshops). Existing initiatives also included the Nansen model of integrated education, which encourages bilingual education at the primary and secondary levels (Nansen Dialogue Centre 2012). Through the UNICEF project, staff from the Centre for Shared Education organized a series of in-country workshops that explored the theoretical perspectives that underpin shared education and other approaches to diversity in educational settings. The staff also coordinated a study tour of Northern Ireland that included visits to partnering schools and meetings with academics, civil servants, third-sector organizations, and teachers involved in shared education. With a view to informing future initiatives in Macedonia, these meetings focused particularly on approaches to mainstreaming

shared education in Northern Ireland, which included an advocacy strategy that promoted shared education at the policy level and the creation of a steering group to inform this work.

In 2011, following the conclusion of the UNICEF project, USAID, working with the Center for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution (CHRCR) and the Macedonian Civic Education Center in Skopje, introduced the state-wide IIEP, which operated from December 2011 until March 2017. The IIEP was ambitious in scope and included strands to, first, raise awareness of the importance of interethnic education and, second, develop capacity within the system to deliver it. The project's third strand, which focused on building relationships among students, was influenced by the Northern Ireland model of shared education. It was designed with the guidance and involvement of CHRCR, which also participated in the UNICEF-QUB project. This strand encouraged collaboration across linguistic boundaries, thereby forging partnerships between institutions with different languages of instruction and developing mixed activities within multilanguage schools. Activities for students were delivered bilingually (and occasionally trilingually), with teachers providing instruction in Macedonian and Albanian in most cases, in Macedonian and Turkish in some cases, and in Macedonian, Albanian, and Turkish in the three-language schools. Staff from the Centre for Shared Education at QUB continued to be involved with the program as consultants. The fourth strand of the IIEP involved refurbishing schools as an incentive to participate in integration activities.

With reference to key frameworks on policy transfer in education, we can make several observations about this case. First, as Phillips and Ochs (2003, 2004) advocate, schools participated in the transfer voluntarily, rather than being directed or coerced to do so. UNICEF, and subsequently USAID, appointed researchers from QUB to address educational segregation in Macedonia. The "impulses" (Phillips and Ochs 2003, 452) or preconditions for policy transfer were thus observed to be dissatisfaction with existing approaches to integration in Macedonia and a corresponding desire to improve interethnic relations. Moreover, what Phillips and Ochs (2003, 453) term the "foci of attraction" (that is, the aspects of education policy and practice that are borrowed) were the processes associated with the shared education model. Second, transfer in this case was a collaborative process between colleagues from Northern Ireland and Macedonia. This ensured that decisions were guided by those with knowledge of the local context and were realistic and practical rather than merely expedient (Phillips and Ochs 2003, 455). Finally, in terms of the level of transfer (Hulme 2005), this example occurred largely at the interorganizational level between a university and

two NGOs. Given the slow progress on integration at the state level in Macedonia (Fontana 2016), an NGO-led initiative like this one arguably offered a better chance of addressing segregation in education. However, including an outreach strand implied the recognition that the long-term sustainability of such a program would depend on state support.

COMPARING THE DESIGN OF SHARED EDUCATION ACROSS BOTH COUNTRIES

The influence of the Northern Ireland model of shared education is evident in the design of the IIEP, particularly its adoption of a model of collaboration between separate schools or different linguistic groups within multilanguage schools. Mirroring shared education's advocacy strategy, the IIEP prioritized engagement with stakeholders outside the school to build capacity for interethnic integration. However, the IIEP also adapted or omitted features of shared education so that its effort can be described more accurately as emulating than copying the Northern Ireland program (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). This is particularly evident in the differential importance attached to educational objectives—that is, extending the curriculum and improving educational opportunities. In Northern Ireland, educational objectives are given parity with social aims in recognition of the fact that schools are more likely to engage in collaboration that offers explicit educational benefits. In Macedonia, while there have been efforts to develop sharing around certain subjects in the curriculum, the discourse of integration is more prevalent.

After examining contextual influences on policy transfer (Phillips and Ochs 2003, 2004; Steiner-Khamsi 2014), we attribute this difference, first, to the policy of mother-tongue education in Macedonia and, second, to the designation of subjects as curricular or extracurricular. Widespread access to education in pupils' first language and a corresponding lack of proficiency in the language of the other makes the joint delivery of academic subjects less feasible in Macedonia than in Northern Ireland. Interethnic education in a minority of schools thus has focused on curricular subjects that are not so dependent on mother-tongue instruction, such as English, fine arts, and information and communication technology, but it has more commonly centered on activities such as sports, drama, and music. While these are curricular subjects in Northern Ireland, most are designated as extracurricular in Macedonia; moreover, although required by law, provision and participation vary in practice. Consequently, extending curricular provision via collaboration has not been part of the policy discourse in Macedonia as it has been in Northern Ireland.

A second difference between the two programs is their scale and pace of development. As Phillips and Ochs note, the implementation of transferred policy may be “speedy or long-term in nature, depending on the adaptability of particular policy measures” (2003, 456). In Macedonia, development of the IIEP was rapid and widespread—far more so than in Northern Ireland, where shared education was first implemented in a limited number of schools via three pilot programs over six years. Moreover, the Northern Ireland initiative was extended only after the pilots had ended. In Macedonia, by contrast, IIEP sought to involve all of the country’s 447 schools within three years of the introduction of shared education (Petroska-Beshka and Osmani 2016). Developing the project at this speed has arguably required a more directive approach in Macedonia than in Northern Ireland, including increased guidance about the structure of the activities (see Jankulovska and Tahir 2013; Pistolov et al. 2016).

A third difference between the two programs relates to the role of financial incentives. While shared education has been presented to schools in Northern Ireland as a way to conserve resources, this has been less common in Macedonia. Again, the reasons for this may be found in the local context: while partnerships in Northern Ireland can reduce expenditures by sharing staff and materials, this is less feasible when operating in multiple languages. The funding available to schools also differed. Most of the initial costs in Northern Ireland, such as for transport, were met through the pilot programs and, subsequently, by the Shared Education Signature Project. In Macedonia, however, while funding through USAID supported the core strands of the program, school-based activities did not benefit equally. Schools instead sought financial support for these activities from municipal authorities, with mixed success (Petroska-Beshka and Osmani 2016). Resources for refurbishing the participating schools were similarly limited: of 99 schools that applied in 2014, for example, only 10 were selected for renovation (Interethnic Integration in Education Program 2014).

Having explored the development of shared education and its transfer between universities and NGOs, in the following section we consider how these programs have been perceived and implemented at the school level. As Alexiadou and van de Bunt-Kokhuis have argued, “policy implementation [is] socially constructed, and enacted by individuals who are located within specific institutional frameworks” (2013, 345); consequently, for a full analysis of policy transfer, we must consider how new policies “interact with traditions, ideologies, forms of organization and cultures of practice that have developed locally” (347). Employing a comparative approach, we examine how the interactions between policy, actor, and context shape the development of shared and interethnic education in each setting.

SHARED AND INTERETHNIC EDUCATION IN PRACTICE

Interviews, the principal method of data collection, were conducted with representatives of two school partnerships in each jurisdiction. The selected partnerships offered contrasting settings for the implementation of shared education in terms of the nature of relations within the local area (largely integrated or divided), the setting (urban or rural, applicable in NI), and/or the phase of education (primary or postprimary, applicable in Macedonia). In Northern Ireland, the interviews were conducted with staff of schools belonging to two school partnerships. These schools participated in the first phase of the Sharing Education Programme, a shared education initiative. The first partnership was comprised of four coeducational postprimary schools, two Catholic and two Protestant. Three of these schools were located in a market town with a mixed population and a recent history of harmonious relations; the fourth school was located in a largely Catholic area approximately ten miles away. The second partnership involved three postprimary girls' schools, two Catholic and one Protestant. These schools were located within walking distance of each other in an urban area where segregation and intergroup tension persist. Both partnerships provided shared classes for students ages 16 to 18; the rural partnership offered A-level examination courses, and the urban partnership offered a course on personal effectiveness.

In Macedonia, interviews were conducted with staff of three "demonstration schools," two primary and one postprimary, that were participating in IIEP. The schools were selected to participate in a more extensive program of shared activities and to serve as exemplars for other institutions. The postprimary school was a multilanguage institution that operated two shifts in one building, one for Albanian pupils and one for Macedonian and Turkish pupils; space had been created for shared activities at the end of the first shift. The school was located in a mixed rural town with a high level of residential segregation. The two primary schools were separate Albanian- and Macedonian-language schools located in neighboring, largely homogeneous towns. The schools had a collaborative arrangement in which their pupils and teachers met regularly for shared activities. As in all demonstration schools, the program of shared classes and activities was determined by the partners. In these schools, the program included additional language-acquisition workshops, multicultural workshops, shared classes for English and sports, outdoor "teaching in nature" classes, mixed extracurricular activities in areas such as art and performance, and excursions to local sites of interest, including those with cultural or religious importance for a particular ethnic group.

Ten interviewees participated in Northern Ireland, including four school principals (two from Catholic backgrounds and two Protestant), two vice principals (both Protestant), and four teachers (two Catholic and two Protestant). Thirteen interviewees participated in Macedonia, including four staff from CHRCR, which supports shared activities, three school principals (two Albanian and one Macedonian), and six teachers (three Albanian and three Macedonian). The senior school staff in both countries were selected because of their strategic role in overseeing their respective partnerships, while the teaching staff were selected based on their experience of implementing shared activities in the classroom. NGO staff were also interviewed in Macedonia because of their experience developing the program and supporting schools within it. Seventeen participants (six in Northern Ireland and eleven in Macedonia) were interviewed separately, while six (four in Northern Ireland and two in Macedonia) were interviewed in pairs. In Northern Ireland these pairs comprised staff from the same school, while in Macedonia the pairs comprised two shared education coordinators.

Interviews were conducted primarily by Hughes, with assistance from colleagues from the Centre for Shared Education, and each lasted up to an hour. A semi-structured approach was employed to ensure that all interviews covered the same topics while allowing the interviewer to adapt individual questions to the interviewee's role as principal, teacher, or coordinator. Topics included their reason for participating in shared/interethnic education, the challenges and benefits of implementing the program, and their approach to building relationships and exploring difference. All interviewees were advised in advance of the nature and purpose of the research, the topics of discussion for the interview, and the guarantee of confidentiality and anonymity; they accordingly agreed to participate. In Macedonia, a local interpreter was present to translate between Albanian or Macedonian and English where required, and the interpreter was fully briefed in advance about the initiative and the research. Several of the participants could converse in English, thus using an interpreter for the remaining interviews was considered the most appropriate approach; however, we acknowledge that nuances may have been lost in translation.

The data were transcribed by Loader and a research assistant at QUB and verified by Hughes. Loader conducted most of the analysis, while the coding frame and themes were checked and amended in consultation with the coauthors. Any areas of uncertainty that arose during the analysis, particularly those relating to the cultural and policy contexts of each country, were clarified with other members of the research team. Coding was undertaken using a thematic approach, which involved full coding of all data, refining the initial codes, and grouping the codes

into themes and subthemes. The resulting key themes, which correspond to the headings below, provide some insight into how shared education was interpreted and implemented as it moved from Northern Ireland to Macedonia and from policy to practice (Cowen 2009; Steiner-Khamisi 2012).

MOTIVE FOR PARTICIPATION

Shared education in Northern Ireland has been promoted with three aims: enhancing educational provision, conserving resources, and improving intergroup relations. In interviews, however, when discussing their motives for participation, principals and teachers referred most frequently to educational and economic imperatives, particularly the opportunity to extend the school's subject offerings, in keeping with the new legal requirements under the Entitlement Framework. Social outcomes were mentioned less often, which suggests some divergence between those designing and those delivering shared education. For the principal of a rural grammar school, for example, collaboration was of value because it helped his school meet minimum curriculum requirements and deliver the academic subjects necessary for a "grammar school education," thereby strengthening its appeal to parents. Building relationships was at most a secondary priority, which was a source of frustration for the principal of a Protestant school, who suggested that, in their partnership, "the mechanistic need to deliver a [broader] curriculum" had obscured the focus on social cohesion.

Other interviewees suggested that social and educational aims could be complementary but that the latter was prioritized in practice. A teacher from the urban Protestant school illustrated this, remarking that the opportunity to study for a qualification that was offered only through shared education was what motivated the pupils to participate in the program. In her view, if the activities had lacked a curricular focus, "the girls would be saying there is no value in it and they don't want to go." One Catholic headteacher revealed the limited focus on reconciliation, noting that the social aims of shared education were simultaneously "a natural part" of the program and "not something we even talk about." Neither interviewee suggested how social benefits were to be achieved. Rather, in these schools and others, improved relations were considered an inevitable consequence of mixing students in class and were given little specific attention.

In Macedonia, by contrast, the program's objective of enhancing integration was more widely reflected at the level of practice. Lacking the educational policy drivers that motivated collaboration in Northern Ireland, participating teachers in Macedonia were more likely to espouse a personal commitment to improving

intergroup relations. Two interviewees (one Albanian, one Macedonian) referred to their own experiences as motivating factors: one recalled studying at a mixed school as a child, while another described the multicultural friendship group she had developed as a university student. Both spoke of a desire to provide their pupils with similar opportunities. A third teacher, from a Macedonian background, had become involved in order to share the experience she had accrued from previous intercultural education initiatives. With their focus on relationship-building, such comments suggest a greater alignment of aims between teachers and program designers in Macedonia than among those in Northern Ireland.

This commitment to enhancing relations could be thwarted, however, by the lack of extrinsic incentives for participation. In contrast to Northern Ireland, where sharing occurred through regular curriculum classes, the extracurricular nature of shared student activities in Macedonia required teachers to work more than their mandatory curriculum hours. As there was no additional payment for this work nor any operative mechanism for career enhancement, there was some resistance from teachers, despite the legal requirement to provide these elective activities. Indeed, the lack of remuneration for the additional work was described as “the biggest complaint from the teachers from both sides” (project coordinator, Albanian-language school). Also challenging was an apparently disparate commitment to the program between Macedonian- and Albanian-language schools, with program coordinators reporting less interest and engagement among the latter. This was thought to reflect wider issues with educational quality in these schools, as well as more widespread disengagement from (perceived) state-sanctioned activities among ethnic Albanians.

IMPLEMENTING AND FUNDING SHARED ACTIVITIES

Across both jurisdictions, the implementation of shared and interethnic education required considerable organization of schedules and transport. In Northern Ireland, coordinating timetables across schools was among the most frequently cited challenges, particularly where a large number of subjects was delivered collaboratively. Interviewees described the need for “a lot of pre-planning of the timetable” (teacher, Protestant school) and raised concerns that this created “significant challenges . . . in terms of flexibility” (principal, Protestant school). While this could be frustrating, interviewees weighed such challenges against the educational value of collaboration, particularly curriculum enhancement, and for that reason they remained committed. They also reported that scheduling became easier over time, although several teachers remained resistant to extending shared education to the lower schools due the scheduling difficulties it would present.

Moving pupils between schools was similarly complex, particularly where partner institutions were some distance from each other or located in areas where travelling on foot was unsafe. Interviewees reported that travelling could be disruptive and expressed concerns about the impact on the timetable (“a class that would be an hour in actual fact is one-and-a-half”; teacher, Protestant school) and the loss of contact time (“someone who is coming to us from the high school . . . they could be losing out on maybe ten minutes of GCSE music or ten minutes of an A-level class”; principal, Catholic school), as well as the cost of coaches and taxis. They spoke of the assistance provided by the project funding, particularly for transport, which they said had been vital to the frequency and sustainability of shared activities.

Teachers in Macedonia faced similar challenges in scheduling shared activities and transporting pupils between schools, although these issues were exacerbated by the lack of financial support available to schools and the limited space in which to hold shared classes. Due to the lack of capacity within the school building, the multilanguage school in our study operated separate shifts for different languages of instruction. This meant that pupils from different language groups were in school at different times and, consequently, opportunities for joint activities were limited. To address this, shared activities were scheduled at the end of the first shift, the hope being that those in the second shift would arrive early to participate. While this appeared the most feasible approach, schools faced the persistent problem of pupils from the second shift being unable or choosing not to arrive early.

Where sharing occurred between rather than within schools, travel difficulties compounded scheduling concerns. With geographic and residential segregation prevalent in Macedonia, transport was required to cover the long distances between schools or to prevent exposing students to hostility in areas of tension. However, meeting the cost of this was difficult due to the lack of reliable funding, which led to some risky situations. For example, staff from one partnership had attempted to reduce costs by transporting pupils on foot, and they described incidents of ethnic violence that had occurred as they travelled between schools. Despite this, the coordinating staff was ambivalent about meeting the additional cost of transport, arguing that the program’s sustainability would depend on support from state and municipal government rather than short-term project funding. In July 2016, shortly after the interviews were completed, the law was changed to provide financial support up to 30,000 Macedonian denars (approximately U.S. \$600), via an open bid process, to schools for activities involving ethnically and/or linguistically mixed groups of pupils. While a significant step in securing

state support for interethnic education, the timing of this change was such that it had little impact on most IIEP activities. At the time of writing, the effectiveness of this funding was still to be determined.

PROMOTING INTEGRATION AND DEALING WITH DIFFERENCE

Shared education in Northern Ireland has been characterized by its non-directive approach, with school partners encouraged to build activities around their existing priorities. While it is anticipated that they will “create a space where . . . young people are allowed to talk about identity, Catholics and Protestants, community and culture” (SEP 2008, 2), schools are not required to specify how they will do this. In the absence of such a requirement, it appeared that schools had given little consideration to the mechanics of relationship-building. There was no reference in the interviews to teachers participating in training to prepare for mixed classes or adopting particular pedagogical approaches. Indeed, staff generally saw little need for specific training for shared education, believing they already had the skills and attitudes necessary to lead shared classes. Two interviewees (both Catholics from rural schools) suggested, moreover, that teachers’ attempts to orchestrate relationship-building could be counterproductive, and they preferred to let interactions take their own course. Only when interviewees had encountered a difficult situation, such as a staff member reacting poorly to a perceived insult during a shared activity, did the matter of staff development arise.

This laissez-faire approach extended to the exploration of political, cultural, or religious differences through shared education, which was not widespread. Teachers and principals from each religious group and both rural and urban areas spoke of having limited time during curriculum classes to address such issues, or they said they were uncomfortable exploring differences in mixed groups and preferred to emphasize pupils’ common experiences. Discussions of community differences that arose between pupils were not always welcome: a teacher in an urban Catholic school, for example, made it clear that she had not encouraged her pupils’ conversation about St. Patrick’s Day.² There were exceptions to this attitude, most notably a Schools Across Borders project that was delivered at the three urban schools. The project involved learning about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and included discussions with students visiting from that region, along with role play and perspective-taking exercises. However, comments from the teacher leading this class suggested that there had been limited opportunity to

² As the feast of the patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick’s Day has tended to be celebrated more widely among Catholics than among Protestants in Northern Ireland.

explore the parallels between the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Northern Ireland experience.

In Macedonia, in keeping with the IIEP's emphasis on integration, staff gave greater consideration to diversity in the development and delivery of the shared education program. This was evident in their approach to capacity-building with teachers, which encouraged them to reflect on their own beliefs and attitudes and to consider the implications they had for their teaching. This consideration was also apparent in efforts to promote equal status between the different groups in shared classes, including using all languages equitably in the classroom and selecting the same number of students from each ethnic group to participate in activities, such as multicultural workshops. To promote positive encounters, the activities were limited to "24 students, 12 of them Macedonians and 12 Albanians, all gender-balanced, 6 Albanian boys and 6 girls, and the same with Macedonian students" (teacher, Albanian-language school).

With respect to the exploration of difference, however, the picture was more mixed. For example, while multicultural workshops sought to explore pupils' diverse cultural backgrounds and enhance their interactions, the highly structured sessions left little opportunity to discuss potentially more contentious issues, such as discrimination and social injustice. This preference for celebratory activities was characteristic of the IIEP and reflected a desire among staff to avoid disturbing the delicate harmony within the group. Illustrating this, a teacher at the Albanian-language school said she did not wish to "break the atmosphere by talking about something that is not pleasant." Arguing that integration was better served by "interesting activities when [pupils] will have positive feelings" (teacher, multicultural school), interviewees described the exploration of difference as undesirable. In this respect, the Northern Ireland program's tendency to avoid discussions of difference was replicated in Macedonia, at least with respect to the more sensitive aspects.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

At the outset of this article we outlined two aims: to identify lessons learned that can improve the implementation of current and future shared education initiatives, and to analyze the policy transfer process and answer key questions about the purpose, nature, and impact of transfer. While acknowledging that this study was small in scale and that our conclusions are thus largely indicative,

we reflect in this section on our findings and their implications relative to these research aims.

LESSONS FOR THE DELIVERY AND TRANSFER OF SHARED EDUCATION

The foregoing analysis has highlighted a number of features of shared education in Northern Ireland that have been incorporated into the IIEP in Macedonia. These include the development of school collaboration as a way to enhance contact between pupils from different ethnic backgrounds, the emphasis on regular and sustained encounters (where feasible), and the inclusion in the program of an advocacy strand to build support among school leaders and education officials. The presence of these features in the Macedonian program speaks to their “transferability” across divided education systems. A model of school collaboration, for example, can provide pupils with regular opportunities to meet peers from a different ethnic or cultural group without the perceived threat to school and community identity that may accompany proposals to amalgamate separate schools (Loader and Hughes 2017). Although this model has its own challenges, especially with scheduling and transport, findings from this study indicate that these challenges diminish over time and are considered by staff to be outweighed by the program’s benefits.

In addition to collaboration and advocacy, the lack of opportunity to discuss the more contentious aspects of difference is a further similarity between the two programs, although this appears to have been unplanned. Particularly evident at the level of practice, this was attributable to time limitations or to teachers’ anxiety and their unwillingness to encourage such discussions. Although the lack of discussion might preserve harmony in mixed groups, as was the intention, it also can mean that the beliefs and practices that perpetuate inequality and discrimination remain unaddressed (Dovidio et al. 2016; Maoz 2011). While this suggests a need for further support and guidance on engaging with issues of conflict and social justice, it also speaks to the importance of clarifying the intended outcomes and markers of success within shared and interethnic education. At present, the absence of formal expectations as to what these programs should achieve (and, specifically, the role of intergroup dialogue) and how it should be demonstrated can result in program delivery that varies across schools and may not fulfill certain (currently informal) aspirations of the model. Clearer objectives and expectations in both countries could help to address this. At the same time, the particular efforts to promote intergroup understanding in Macedonia should be acknowledged, especially the extensive teacher training and the attention to ethnic and gender balance in mixed activities. There are lessons in this approach

for Northern Ireland, which has given these aspects of shared education only limited attention.

As this last point indicates, the study has also revealed several areas of divergence between shared and interethnic education. Perhaps the most significant of these is the different emphasis on educational aims (i.e., improving educational quality and extending the curriculum) within the respective programs. The shared education model developed in Northern Ireland puts similar importance on social and educational aims, but the latter receive only limited attention in Macedonia. This in part reflects different emphases in the two countries' education policies. Given the focus on performativity in Northern Ireland, the program's educational aims have been prioritized to ensure that it is not marginalized, as prior school-based contact initiatives were. While education in Macedonia is not performance-orientated to the same degree, the country's increasing focus on improving educational standards (see Auld and Morris 2014) may mean that interethnic education will struggle to gain long-term traction unless it can demonstrate that it has a positive impact on education provision. One way to do this would be to link interethnic education to the current priority to improve the physical environment of schools in Macedonia, thereby highlighting the potential of collaboration to promote the sharing of high-quality facilities. Another approach might be to more strongly promote the economic case for interethnic and bilingual education in a plural and global society, thereby addressing the concerns about economic competitiveness that drive most policy transfer. In Northern Ireland, the lack of attention to social aims may similarly limit the program's potential, in this case to foster long-term change in relations. Current and future shared education initiatives must pay careful attention to the balance of social and educational aims if they are to ensure progress on both.

A second evident difference between the two programs is one of scale. In Macedonia, the IIEP was introduced more rapidly and more extensively than the program in Northern Ireland, and with more significant outreach and capacity-building functions. Consequently, resources were spread more thinly in Macedonia, with many schools receiving little or no financial support for interethnic activities until the changes were made in state funding in July 2016. While acknowledging the difference in available financing between these countries, the current study demonstrates the importance of adequate resourcing for shared education, particularly in the early stages. Securing appropriate support from relevant education authorities or independent funders prior to a large-scale rollout should therefore be a priority for future initiatives.

ANALYZING POLICY TRANSFER

Our second aim in this article was to provide an analysis of policy transfer between Northern Ireland and Macedonia. Drawing on Phillips and Ochs's (2003) model, we have explained that policy transfer in this case was a voluntary process undertaken by two NGOs, UNICEF and USAID, in conjunction with the Centre for Shared Education at QUB in response to a need to address educational segregation in Macedonia. Motivated by discontent with existing approaches to integration, these organizations looked to the Northern Ireland model for a strategy—that is, interschool collaboration—and supporting processes to improve intergroup relations through schools. Collaboration between the two countries ensured that the resulting initiative in Macedonia was realistic and based on an understanding of local dynamics.

The program that resulted in Macedonia was thus an emulation rather than a copy of the Northern Ireland initiative (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000), which is a reflection of the differences between the two contexts. These include multiple languages in Macedonia, the differing designation of subjects as curricular or extracurricular across the two countries, and Northern Ireland's greater emphasis on collaboration in education policy. Such adaptations may be legitimate to ensure the model's success in a new context, but they also raise issues of integrity. If at least one of the original model's core aims—in this case, to enhance curriculum delivery and educational quality—is de-emphasized in the new context, can the new initiative be accurately described as an example of shared education? As Northern Ireland shares its experience with other countries, the question of what defines shared education and what ought to be emphasized in transfer may require further consideration.

Analysis of the transfer process also demonstrated that differences could emerge in practice, even when the design was similar in the two countries. For example, while the model of school collaboration was adopted by the IIEP in Macedonia, it was hindered by a lack of engagement among some Albanian-language schools. Consequently, the contribution made to school partnerships by Macedonian-language and Albanian-language schools could be less equal than intended and less equal than was typical between collaborating schools in Northern Ireland. Such findings highlight the importance of examining the design, implementation, and "enactment" (Ball, Maguire, and Braun 2012, 6) of policy in both the originating and the receiving context. As Ball and colleagues argue, policy is "interpreted and translated and reconstructed and remade" (2012, 6) in schools and classrooms, and analyses of policy transfer should take this into consideration.

As we noted at the outset, international education has put increasing emphasis on policy transfer as a way to enhance educational performance and economic competitiveness among individual nation-states. In this article, we have considered transfer for another purpose: to build social cohesion in societies experiencing ethnic or religious division. There is a need for further work in this area, both to create space for educational transfer of this type and, through examination of real-world cases, to provide theoretical insights and guidance on effective practice. As the experience of shared education has demonstrated, such endeavors will depend on effective collaboration among all relevant actors—academics, NGOs, policy professionals, and perhaps most fundamentally, educators themselves.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Safet Balazhi and Filipina Negrievska for their help with the organization of interviews in Macedonia and Professor Ruth Leitch for her assistance with data collection.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, Robin. 2001. *Culture and Pedagogy: International Comparisons in Primary Education*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Alexiadou, Nafsika, and Sylvia van de Bunt-Kokhuis. 2013. "Policy Space and the Governance of Education: Transnational Influences on Institutions and Identities in the Netherlands and the UK." *Comparative Education* 49 (3): 344-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2013.803750>.
- Allport, Gordon. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Andrews, Paul, Andreas Ryve, Kirsti Hemmi, and Judy Sayers. 2014. "PISA, TIMSS and Finnish Mathematics Teaching: An Enigma in Search of an Explanation." *Educational Studies in Mathematics* 87 (1): 7-26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-014-9545-3>.
- Auld, Euan, and Paul Morris. 2014. "Comparative Education, the 'New Paradigm' and Policy Borrowing: Constructing Knowledge for Educational Reform." *Comparative Education* 50 (2): 129-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2013.826497>.

- Ball, Stephen J., Meg Maguire, and Annette Braun. 2012. *How Schools Do Policy: Policy Enactments in Secondary Schools*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Burdett, Newman, and Sharon O'Donnell. 2016. "Lost in Translation? The Challenges of Educational Policy Borrowing." *Educational Research* 58 (2): 113-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2016.1168678>.
- Cowen, Robert. 2009. "The Transfer, Translation and Transformation of Educational Processes: And Their Shape-Shifting?" *Comparative Education* 45 (3): 315-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060903184916>.
- Cowen, Robert. 2014. "Ways of Knowing, Outcomes and 'Comparative Education': Be Careful What You Pray For." *Comparative Education* 50 (3): 282-301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2014.921370>.
- Dedova, Renata, Safet Balazi, Saso N. Alusevski, Filipina Negrievska, and Violeta Petroska-Beshka. 2010. *A Selection of Multicultural Workshops for Primary and Secondary Schools*. Skopje, Macedonia: UNICEF.
- Department of Education (Northern Ireland). 2017. "Enrolments by School Management Type: 2000/01-2016/7." <https://www.education-ni.gov.uk/publications/school-enrolments-northern-ireland-summary-data>.
- Dimmock, Clive, and Cheng Yong Tan. 2016. "Explaining the Success of the World's Leading Education Systems: The Case of Singapore." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 64 (2): 161-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2015.1116682>.
- Divala, Joseph Jinja. 2014. "The Ethics and Politics in Educational Policy Development and Practice." *Ethics and Education* 9 (1): 97-101.
- Dolowitz, David P., and David Marsh. 2000. "Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy-Making." *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration* 13 (1): 5-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0952-1895.00121>.
- Dovidio, John F., Samuel L. Gaertner, Elze G. Ufkes, Tamar Saguy, and Adam R. Pearson. 2016. "Included but Invisible? Subtle Bias, Common Identity, and the Darker Side of 'We.'" *Social Issues and Policy Review* 10 (1): 6-46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12017>.

- Fontana, Giuditta. 2016. *Education Policy and Power-Sharing in Post-Conflict Societies*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gallagher, Tony. 2004. *Education in Divided Societies*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grayling, Anthony C. 2005. "Two Words of Warning: Northern Ireland." *Times Educational Supplement*, July 15, 2005. <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=2116736>.
- Halpin, David, and Barry Troyna. 1995. "The Politics of Education Policy Borrowing." *Comparative Education* 31 (3): 303-10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050069528994>.
- Hansson, Ulf, Una O'Connor-Bones, and John McCord. 2013. *Integrated Education: A Review of Policy and Research Evidence 1999-2012*. Belfast, NI: Integrated Education Fund and University of Ulster.
- Harris, Alma, Michelle Jones, and Donnie Adams. 2016. "Qualified to Lead? A Comparative, Contextual and Cultural View of Educational Policy Borrowing." *Educational Research* 58 (2): 166-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2016.1165412>.
- Hayes, Bernadette C., Ian McAllister, and Lizanne Dowds. 2007. "Integrated Education, Intergroup Relations, and Political Identities in Northern Ireland." *Social Problems* 54 (4): 454-82. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2007.54.4.454>.
- Hayes, Bernadette C., Ian McAllister, and Lizanne Dowds. 2013. "Integrated Schooling and Religious Tolerance in Northern Ireland." *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 28 (1): 67-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537903.2013.750837>.
- Hewstone, Miles, and Hermann Swart. 2011. "Fifty-Odd Years of Intergroup Contact: From Hypothesis to Integrated Theory." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 50 (3): 374-86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02047.x>.
- Hughes, Joanne, Andrea Campbell, Simon Lolliot, Miles Hewstone, and Tony Gallagher. 2013. "Inter-group Contact at School and Social Attitudes: Evidence from Northern Ireland." *Oxford Review of Education* 39 (6): 761-79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2013.857595>.

DEVELOPING SOCIAL COHESION THROUGH SCHOOLS IN NORTHERN IRELAND
AND THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

- Hughes, Joanne, Caitlin Donnelly, Miles Hewstone, Tony Gallagher, and Karen Carlisle. 2010. *School Partnerships and Reconciliation: An Evaluation of School Collaboration in Northern Ireland*. Belfast, NI: Queen's University Belfast.
- Hulme, Rob. 2005. "Policy Transfer and the Internationalisation of Social Policy." *Social Policy and Society* 4 (4): 417-25.
- Independent Strategic Review of Education. 2006. *Schools for the Future: Funding, Strategy, Sharing*. Bangor, NI: Department of Education.
- Interethnic Integration in Education Program. 2014. "Project Digest 2014." <http://pmio.mk/project-digests/fifth-edition-of-the-project-digest-2014>.
- Jankulovska, Snezana, and Tulaha Tahir. 2013. *A School Promoting Interethnic Integration in Education*. Skopje, Macedonia: USAID Interethnic Integration in Education Project.
- Johansson, Stefan. 2016. "International Large-Scale Assessments: What Uses, What Consequences?" *Educational Research* 58 (2): 139-48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2016.1165559>.
- Knox, Colin. 2013. "Shared Education: A Case Study in Policy Advocacy." Paper presented at the Conference on the Impact and Potential of Shared Education, Belfast, NI, June 26-27, 2013. <http://www.schoolsworkingtogether.co.uk/documents/ConferenceJune13/Colin%20Knox.pdf>.
- Koneska, Cvete. 2012. "Veto, Ethnic Bidding, Decentralisation: Post-Conflict Education in Macedonia." *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 11 (4): 28-50.
- Loader, Rebecca, and Joanne Hughes. 2017. "Balancing Cultural Diversity and Social Cohesion in Education: The Potential of Shared Education in Divided Contexts." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 65 (1): 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2016.1254156>.
- Lyon, Aisling. 2013. "Decentralisation and the Provision of Primary and Secondary Education in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia." *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights* 20 (4): 491-516. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718115-02004001>.

- Maoz, Ifat. 2011. "Does Contact Work in Protracted Asymmetrical Conflict? Appraising 20 Years of Reconciliation-Aimed Encounters Between Israeli Jews and Palestinians." *Journal of Peace Research* 48 (1): 115-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343310389506>.
- Ministry of Education and Science. 2010. *Steps towards Integrated Education in the Educational System of the Republic of Macedonia*. Skopje, Macedonia: Ministry of Education and Science.
- Morris, Paul. 2012. "Pick 'N' Mix, Select and Project: Policy Borrowing and the Quest for 'World Class' Schooling. An Analysis of the 2010 Schools White Paper." *Journal of Education Policy* 27 (1): 89-107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2011.596226>.
- Murray, Dominic. 1985. *Worlds Apart: Segregated Schools in Northern Ireland*. Belfast, NI: Appletree.
- Nansen Dialogue Centre. 2012. *Nansen Model for Integrated Education*. Skopje, Macedonia: Nansen Dialogue Centre.
- Northern Ireland Executive. 2011. *Program for Government 2011-15*. Belfast, NI: Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister.
- Ochs, Kimberly. 2006. "Cross-National Policy Borrowing and Educational Innovation: Improving Achievement in the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham." *Oxford Review of Education* 32 (5): 599-618. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980600976304>.
- O'Connor, Una, Brendan Hartop, and Alan McCully. 2002. *A Review of the Schools Community Relations Program*. Bangor, NI: Department of Education.
- Petroska-Beshka, Violeta, and Sara Osmani. 2016. *Report from the Electronic Survey on the Implementation of IIEP: September 2016*. Skopje, Macedonia: Macedonian Centre for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution.
- Phillips, David, and Kimberly Ochs. 2003. "Processes of Policy Borrowing in Education: Some Explanatory and Analytical Devices." *Comparative Education* 39 (4): 451-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006032000162020>.

- Phillips, David, and Kimberly Ochs. 2004. "Researching Policy Borrowing: Some Methodological Challenges in Comparative Education." *British Educational Research Journal* 30 (6): 773-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141192042000279495>.
- Pistolov, Mitko, Nebojsa Mojsoski, Tulaha Tahir, and Fatima Salifoska. 2016. *40 Sports Activities and Entertainment Games for Integration of Children and Young People*. Skopje, Macedonia: USAID.
- Post-Primary Review Body. 2001. *Report of the Review Body on Post-Primary Education*. Burns Report. Bangor, NI: Department of Education.
- Reka, Armend. 2008. "The Ohrid Agreement: The Travails of Inter-Ethnic Relations in Macedonia." *Human Rights Review* 9 (1): 55-69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12142-007-0029-z>.
- Richardson, Norman. 2011. "Evaluating the Northern Ireland Experience." In *Education for Diversity and Mutual Understanding: The Experience of Northern Ireland*, edited by Norman Richardson and Tony Gallagher. Oxford, UK: Peter Lang, 331-51.
- SEP. 2008. "Schools Working Together." <http://www.schoolsworkingtogether.co.uk/documents/sep-booklet.pdf>.
- Steiner-Khamsi, Gita. 2006. "The Economics of Policy Borrowing and Lending: A Study of Late Adopters." *Oxford Review of Education* 32 (5): 665-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980600976353>.
- Steiner-Khamsi, Gita. 2010. "The Politics and Economics of Comparison." *Comparative Education Review* 54 (3): 323-42. <https://doi.org/10.1086/653047>.
- Steiner-Khamsi, Gita. 2012. "Understanding Policy Borrowing and Lending: Building Comparative Policy Studies." In *Policy Borrowing and Lending in Education: World Yearbook of Education 2012*, edited by Gita Steiner-Khamsi and Florian Waldow. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 3-17.
- Steiner-Khamsi, Gita. 2014. "Cross-National Policy Borrowing: Understanding Reception and Translation." *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 34 (2): 153-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2013.875649>.

Stringer, Maurice, Paul Irwing, Melanie Giles, Carol McClenahan, Ronnie Wilson, and Jackie A. Hunter. 2009. "Intergroup Contact, Friendship Quality and Political Attitudes in Integrated and Segregated Schools in Northern Ireland." *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 79 (2): 239-57. <https://doi.org/10.1348/978185408X368878>.

UNESCO. 2017. "Chairs and UNITWIN Networks." <https://www.unesco.org.uk/designation/unesco-chairs-and-unitwin-networks-in-the-uk/>.